MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE

The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held May 11, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. in Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las Cruces, New Mexico.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla)
Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)
Councilor Jack Eakman (CLC)
Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla)
Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)
Councilor Gill Sorg (CLC)
Councilor Olga Pedroza (CLC)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)
Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Murphy (MPO staff)
Andrew Wray (MPO staff)
Michael McAdams (MPO staff)
Zach Taraschi (MPO staff)

OTHERS PRESENT: Wyatt Kartchner, Molzen Corbin
Jerry Paz, Molzen Corbin
John Montoya
Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:04 PM)

Hancock: All right. The time is now 1:04 and we call the meeting to order.

2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY

Hancock: Does any Member, does any Committee Member have a known or perceived conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so that Committee Member may recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter or if they feel that they can be impartial we will put their participation up for a vote by the rest of the Committee. Do we have any conflicts?

Pedroza: No.

Barraza: No.

Hancock: Very good. Oh the Chair is here. I absolve myself as being Chair now.

Doolittle: I second the absolution.

Wray: Mr. Chair. Your mic is not on.

Sorg: Well it is but I'm *(inaudible)*

Wray: Okay. Ah, got you.

Sorg: See, now I'm, um let me get the agenda out in front of me here please.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: The next item on the agenda I believe is Public Comment. Is there any public comment? Seeing none.

4. CONSENT AGENDA *

Sorg: Um, next item is the Consent Agenda. Is there a ...

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Motion to approve the agenda? Yes.

Wray: Staff has an amendment to the agenda. We need to move Item 6.2 from being an Action Item to being a Discussion Item so we propose moving 6.2 down to become 7.3.

Flores: I'll make a motion.

Sorg: I thought only Consent items were starred, has an asterisk and I don't see where Action Item 6.2 has an asterisk.

Wray: No. We're, we need to amend the agenda itself um because we're not ready to do the UPWP uh, uh, the, we're, staff is not ready to have the Committee vote on the UPWP. We need to amend the agenda.

Sorg: Ah, now I understand. Thank you. So is there a motion to move Action Item 6.2 to Discussion Item 7.3?

Flores: I'll make the motion to move it to, and change it to 7.3 and to move to discussion.

Barraza: Mr. Chair. I will ...

Pedroza: Second.

Barraza: Go ahead. Go ahead Olga.

Sorg: Motion's been made by …

Pedroza: Seconded.

Sorg: Trustee Flores and uh seconded by Councilor Pedroza. Is there a vote please.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Okay. So then there's an amendment to, or is there a motion rather to uh approve the agenda as amended?

Eakman: I would so move.

Flores: I'll second.

Sorg: Moved by,

Flores: Trustee Flores:

Sorg: Moved by Councilor Eakman and second by Trustee Flores. Any discussion? If not we'll have a vote.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes.

5. * APPROVAL OF MINUTES

6.1 * April 13, 2016

- VOTED ON VIA THE CONSENT AGENDA

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Resolution 16-05: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Sorg: Okay. Next item on the agenda then is Action Item 6.1: A Resolution Amending the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I would like ...

Sorg: Is there a motion to approve?

Flores: So moved.

Eakman: Second.

Sorg: Moved by Trustee Flores and, and second by Councilor Eakman. Proceed Mr. Wray.

Wray: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to direct the attention of the Committee to page 52 of your packet. There's a series of TIP amendments that have been requested by New Mexico Department of Transportation and by RoadRUNNER Transit for this month. The first one is TL00013. This is another roll-over funding from Federal Fiscal Year 2015 to Federal Fiscal Year 2016. The new FTA amount is $543,460. The new local match amount is $100,729 for a new total of $643,189.

The next amendment is to TL00010. This is operations, this operations funding category. The new FTA 5307 amount is $2,270,916. The new local match is $1,829,185 for a new project total of $4,100,101.

We're going to skip over discussing LC00160 briefly and I'll, I'll cover that one in just a minute.

Moving down to LC00120, this is the intersection of US-70, Spitz, and Solano uh, uh realignment and improvements project. There's a new project total of $6,200,000.

Regarding LC00160, yesterday I was notified by NMDOT staff that they wish to make a change to the amendment so I'll turn the floor over to NMDOT at this time to discuss this project.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair if I may.

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee. On that um project specifically we need to modify the dollar amounts very slightly. We need to include $1.4 million for design in Fiscal Year '16. The Fiscal Year '17 project cost of $14 million will remain the same. So for that project it will actually have a total project cost of $15.4 million.

Hancock: That is Valley Drive.

Doolittle: That is Valley Drive, correct.

Sorg: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Doolittle, Doolittle. I gotta stop repeating myself. Any other questions? Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. Um, can you a tell me what the new amount is, you know you said what the new amount is. What was the old amount?

Wray: For the ...

Pedroza: Each one of them.

Wray: The previous amount for LC00160 was $11 million and previous amount for LC00120 was $6.2 million.

Pedroza: It's one …

Sorg: That's what it is now, isn't it?

Pedroza: Right. The, what's written on here, new project total six …

Wray: Oh, I'm sorry, $5.45 million. It's on page 61 of your packet.

Pedroza: Oh. Okay. Thank you.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: If I may ask, where is this additional money coming from?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I think I can address that.

Sorg: Okay, Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Mayor. Those are actually modifications and it's coming out of the District 1 STIP budget. Ultimately what we've done is specifically for the Valley Drive project, um after discussions with the City um ultimately wanted, we wanted to increase the total project cost to the $14 million. I discussed that increase with Executive Staff so that is federal funding coming out of the General Office so it is not impacting the District 1 STIP targets at all. The additional money for the Spitz/Three Crosses project is coming out of the District 1 STIP budget and ultimately the, the biggest increase tied to that is due to the retaining wall on the northwest quadrant of that intersection. We have to build a new wall because of the new alignment to that roadway and so once we got the estimate for the wall, the cost increase with, that you see there is the price of the wall.

Barraza: Okay. Thank you.

Hancock: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Would you please let the record reflect that I am here and I'm sorry I had to rush out. Thank you.

Sorg: You, may it be so. Yes. Any other questions on these TIP changes? Okay.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I would make a motion to approve the TIP with my proposed amendment specifically to LC00160 to include $1.4 million for design money in Fiscal Year '16, remaining $14 million in Fiscal Year '17 for a total cost of $15.4 million.

Sorg: I believe that would be a, an amendment to the motion. So yeah, your, we'll take it as that.

Doolittle: Okay.

Sorg: Is there a ...

Barraza: I will second the amendment.

Sorg: Okay. Thank you Mayor Barraza. And um, okay. If there's no further discussion I'll call for a vote.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Sorg: On the amendment.

Barraza: On the amendment. Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Okay. Is there any further discussion on the motion for these TIP changes? If not I'll call for a vote.

Wray: Mayor Barraza.

Barraza: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Yes.

Wray: Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Yes.

Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Yes.

Wray: Trustee Flores.

Flores: Yes.

Wray: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes. Mr. Wray could I ask a question though?

Wray: Yes sir.

Sorg: I didn't want to put it as part of that motion. Um this retaining wall that Mr. Doolittle was talking about, that is a long ways away from that intersection. I, what are you going to do there? Are you going to use that property between what would be Three Crosses and the retaining wall?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. That, that is correct. Our current proposed design to increase the efficiency of that intersection is moving Three Crosses to the north. We are actually purchasing that entire property up to the face of that wall, actually it, it incorporates that wall itself. But we will be shifting that roadway alignment to the north.

Sorg: Do we have a engineering plans for that whole intersection yet?

Doolittle: We are at I believe 90% design for the intersection itself. We have a meeting with City staff next Thursday to discuss the retaining wall itself and I believe we're at 65% design on the wall.

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: But for the intersection itself we are at 90%.

Sorg: Is it possible the Committee could just take a peek at that design when it's ready?

Doolittle: I will work on getting a copy of the current design or at least a link to the design somehow through the MPO staff so that it can be distributed.

Sorg: Well we could see it next meeting maybe, in June. How's that?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Or whenever it's ready.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. I could certainly, I could certainly provide that as part of my monthly update …

Sorg: Okay.

Doolittle: For discussion. At that, by that point I would guess it will be very close to 100% design.

Sorg: Okay. That'd be great. Cause I recall the City Council some time ago was shown a plan. Maybe Councilor Pedroza remembers it.

Pedroza: I can't remember the dates, no.

Sorg: It, it's, it's got to be well over a year, could be two to three years ago now.

Doolittle: Yeah. I remember that.

Sorg: I just wonder if it's changed. Okay. Uh, let's proceed on to the next item on the agenda.

Doolittle: Real quickly Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Sure.

Doolittle: Just for clarification purposes, the plan set itself is rather large. Do you, would, do you want to just see like a plan view of the intersection and alignment itself?

Sorg: Sure.

Doolittle: Just like a one- or two-page aerial view.

Sorg: Sure. That's plenty good now. Thank you.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 West Mesa Study Area

Sorg: Um so the next item would be seven, Discussion Item 7.1. Proceed.

Wray: Yes Mr. Chair. We are pleased today to have with us staff from Molzen Corbin to discuss the West Mesa Study Area.

Sorg: Thank you.

Wray: Mr. Wyatt Kartchner.

Kartchner: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. I want to thank you guys for allowing us to give this presentation today. I'm Wyatt Kartchner with Molzen Corbin out of our Las Cruces office. I'm also joined today by Jerry Paz who's our branch manager for that office. You guys have probably all heard of the West Mesa Corridor Study. It's been around for decades, started as the High Mesa Road Study. Then we did a Phase A study for that project and then we just received notice to proceed, continue with the Phase B portion of the process about two weeks ago so we're, we're kinda getting started on that again. We wanted to give you guys kind of a, an update on where that um project is, kind of the things we're going to be doing in this phase, and then um give you a little background on what we did in the Phase A project.

Our team consists of us, Molzen Corbin as the lead engineer. We also have Souder Miller & Associates doing some engineering. Eco Resources Management Systems, they are doing the traffic modeling and then Marron and Associates is doing the environmental study for it.

The in, introduction here, the West Mesa Road is, basically it's to take a road from the Santa Teresa border crossing and connect it to I-10 somewhere, um we've originally started it on the west side of Las Cruces but we have also expanded that to include areas around NM-404 as well. Right now traffic and all those trucks that cross the border, they have to go along Pete Domenici Highway into Texas, get on I-10 at Artcraft where it's kind of a mess, and then make their way through Las Cruces and then,

especially if they're headed west towards Deming. So this proposed route would keep them out of Texas more than anything and shorten that travel distance. One of the things that we looked at was how much time savings would that be and what the cost for that road would be.

Some of the things that are going on in the border I'm sure you guys are aware, well aware of. There's an industrial park in Santa Teresa, the UP just put in that big rail yard, there's been over 50 new businesses built. The port of entry was expanded. The trade policies have changed. There's an over-weight zone right around the border where heavier trucks can cross the border. There's lots of manufacturing going on in Mexico and on that side of the border and then there's just lots and lots of plans for growth on both sides of the border in that area. There was recently a Santa Teresa International Rail Study that was completed. We've just received some of the information on that so we're going to be updating our alignments to make sure we don't interfere with what the, the railroad was wanting to do there.

As I mentioned before we're in the Phase B process. The Phase A we did in 2013 and 2014 and that's kind of an initial screening of alternatives. We throw out any crazy idea that you may have, screen it down to a few alternatives to carry forward into Phase B. We just received the notice to proceed for Phase B and so that's more of a detailed study. We look at the alternatives that came out of Phase A, we refine them a little bit more, and then we come up with a recommended alternative. We'll look at the traffic impacts, the costs, one of the big factors on this project is the environmental impact, so cultural impacts, any endangered species kinda things like that. And then finally Phase C is the environmental document phase of the process. Currently the NMDOT does not have funding for that phase. However in Phase B, because we know environmental is going to be such a divide, deciding factor we have some field investigations included in that study just to, to make sure that we don't have a fatal flaw from an environmental standpoint.

The NMDOT and FHWA has a study process which we are following and that process includes seven ways that a project can receive funding. Those purposes can be system connectivity, so how do you connect one system to another; physical deficiencies, so if a road is in terrible shape or it needs to be three or four lanes and it's only got one lane, it's, we can upgrade a road based off of that; travel demand or congestion, Las Cruces and this area we really don't experience congestion as you would think as compared to big cities but like Paseo del Norte in Albuquerque was one that was justified based off of some congestion; safety issues can also cause a project to go forward; access and mobility. Any project you do is gonna have some sort of economic develop, development as it's gonna put people, local people to work and so that can also spur a project, and then some of the GRIP projects were legislatively mandated and so a project can also be funded and carried forward that way.

In our Phase A report we had to generate a Purpose and Need Statement and the statement is there in front of you. It says "The purpose of the proposed West Mesa Corridor is to provide a high-speed access-controlled roadway to provide access to Santa Teresa border area from I-10 west of Las Cruces to accommodate growth of the Santa Teresa border region and reduce traffic congestion on the existing roadway facilities." So that was kind of what we, we started with. We needed to, to meet those conditions in order to carry forward with the project. We've kind of, we'll need to modify this statement to take out "I-10 west of Las Cruces" if we go ahead and, when we go ahead and study the 404 connections, it kind of contradicts itself there.

So in the Phase A study we gathered a lot of information. We gathered from our sub-consultant Marron and Associates all the archaeological sites that are out there that are recorded. There's a whole lot more out there I'm sure, so all those red blobs are the recorded archaeological sites and all these different colored lines are proposed alignments that we had for the study. And so we know that we couldn't avoid all of the archaeological sites that are out there but we did our best to avoid huge ones that you might see, I don't know if you guys, there's one here that, just massive that we tried to avoid and so those are one of the factors that we included.

Topography, we didn't want to go through, you can see here the contours get really tight. There's a, a hill right here so we wanted to make sure the road didn't do something silly and go through a mountain when it didn't need to.

And then land ownership was another thing that was a big consideration. A lot of the land out here is either owned by BLM or State. The white pieces you can see are privately-owned property but, so you can see for the most part this blue is State and then this other kind of tan-hatched color is BLM property. And so there wasn't a whole lot of private property that we would be impacting by any of these alignments. As we study the 404 option in more detail in this phase that option is going to have much more impact to private land as it goes through Anthony and through the valley of Las Cruces, towards I-10.

Another thing that we found during our study was that there's a solar zone that's being done by BLM, you can see in this crosshatched area. They didn't have any issues with us going through that but we just wanted to make sure that it was documented.

So this road across the prairie that we don't really know who's going to use or what's going to happen, we had to use traffic modeling. Our traffic modeler, his name is Bob Shull and he actually is the inventor of the VISUM model. He's probably the most well-renowned traffic modeler in, in the country. He's used by the Las Cruces MPO, he's the, Mesilla Valley MPO excuse me, El Paso MPO, he's got the Statewide Transportation Network Model. He invented the model and he is as good of a traffic model guesser as you can, can get. He took data from the

Statewide Transportation Model, he's incorporated data from the Mesilla Valley MPO's model, also the El Paso MPO, and then we also got information from the USDOT Freight Yard, stuff from the Union Pacific, and then we got information from the border crossing to determine, "Okay, what's the land use around the region going to be? How many vehicles will be generated by the border crossing? Where will those vehicles go? How will traffic react by putting this roadway in? Will traffic use it or will they just continue on their, their current route?" And so we modeled the traffic in Phase A for 2010 and 2040. In the Phase B process we will refine those traffic numbers even more. So here's some of the results from that preliminary traffic study. This is 2040 numbers and so traffic and travel congestion is measured on what's called LOS or Level of Service is what LOS stands for, and it's given a grade from A to F, where A being great to F being it's completely jammed and failing. So in 2040 we found that our two-lane roadway which is what we had modeled, one, one lane in each direction would have a Level of Service between D and E which means that there's going to be a lot of cars on the road if we put this in. We found that it would improve the traffic for the regional and interstate trucks rather than local traffic.

If you think about it, if a trucker comes through the Santa Teresa port of entry and he's headed to Los Angeles or somewhere in California, he wants to get there as quickly as possible and so when he came out of Mexico he deliberately used the Santa Teresa rail yard, or Santa Teresa border crossing to get there. If he was going to go east out of Mexico they would probably use a border crossing on the east side of El Paso rather than go through Santa Teresa and then have to navigate through El Paso and so what we found through our traffic study is that most of the traffic is probably going to be headed west. And so Alternative, you can see here in this table, Alternative B was an alternative that tied into the Jackrabbit interchange which is US-70, it's kind of halfway off the, the hill between here and the airport. And you can see there was about 6,600 cars that used it here and 12% trucks. Alternative C tied into the Airport interchange which is where the, the Love's truck stop is, there's about the same volume of traffic and a little bit higher percentage of trucks. If we took that Alternative E which ties it onto the Corralitos interchange which is west of the, the fairgrounds you can see the traffic numbers jump significantly. And then finally if we do just the NM-404 connection so we don't bypass Las Cruces whatsoever, there's only 4,000 cars that would use that and the large majority of them are cars and not trucks. And so these are our preliminary numbers. It kind of seems, some of them seem a little bit strange in that there's such a large discrepancy between the 12,000 and the 6,000 but we were, we're gonna evaluate this again and make sure that we get the best results that we can from our traffic model.

In Phase A our recommendations were for further evaluation or the no-build. Do we really even need to spend $85 to 100 million on a, a road or can we just use or improve the existing infrastructure that we have?

We recommended Alternative B which ties into the Jackrabbit interchange, Alternative C which ties into the Airport interchange, and Alternative E which tied into the, the Corralitos interchange. And then we also didn't want to discount the NM-404 connection. During this Phase B we're going to look at more options to make sure that we didn't miss something that's obvious and then we're going to do some tweaking to these to make sure that with the development and the changes that have happened in the last three years, that nothing has impacted these. And so on your screen here you can see the options that we're going to study further in this Phase B process.

From our Phase A study the conclusions that we could draw were that there is a need for the West Mesa Corridor. It will be used. We found a cost range of $85 to 100 million. That could go up or down depending on if you put a concrete road in. If we cross, if we use the NM-404 connection there's going to be lots of properties that are gonna have to be acquired so right-of-way costs, there'll be a river crossing so that's going to be expensive, and then if we need to upgrade an interchange at Jackrabbit, Airport, or Corralitos to accommodate this heavier volume of traffic. There's lots of environmental impacts that we would need to mitigate as best as possible. And then based off of our, our traffic numbers we found that the connections, the further west you get the better, the higher volume of traffic you're going to see and the benefits of NM-404 are, are marginal.

So in the Phase B which is what we just started we're going to update our, all of our alternatives and incorporate the BNSF rail study. We're going to do new drawings and alignments. We're going to do a complete cost estimate for all of these align, alternatives to, to see which one costs the most. We're going to do an environmental study. Once we kind of narrow down our alternatives our environmental sub-consultant's actually going to walk the entire alignment. Could be 30, 33 miles of walking across the desert to see if there's any endangered species or any cultural resources that we need to avoid. As I mentioned the traffic model's going to be updated. We're going to look at the drainage impacts. All that water's flowing from the west towards the Rio Grande so drainage, there's going to be lots of culverts and we need to know what that cost is going to be.

One of the major evaluation criteria that we've come up with is a cost:benefit ratio. One of the alternatives may have a significantly less cost than the other one but if it doesn't gather any traffic, is it really worth it? And so we're going to determine a way of measuring all of these alternatives apples to apples if you will. Because some of them are going to be 35 miles long, some of them are going to be 30 miles long so of course the 35-mile-long's gonna cost more but if it gets 15,000 cars a day versus one that gets 6,000 a day it's a better investment. And so that's one of the criteria that we're going to weigh. And then we're also going to look at a private-public partnership on this project. New Mexico probably

doesn't have $85 to 100 million to throw at a new road across the desert and so we're going to see if maybe a, a company or a toll road could be put in. I know it could, couldn't be done currently because of the New Mexico's constitution doesn't allow that but we're going to look and see if that's even an option. We've had several people approach us and say, "Hey, we'll build the road if you'll let us toll people." And so we need to look and see is that something that's viable and something that can be done.

Our schedule right now, we have a pretty tight schedule. Our contract actually expires in February of next year so we have to complete our entire Phase B study before then. In June we're planning on having a stakeholder meeting. We have a pretty good list from our last meet, last phase of the project of about 80, 85 people. Then we're going to do a draft Phase B report in November. We'll help hold a public meeting in November and then our final Phase B report will be in January. And then as far as the remaining phases, Phase 1C, the environmental stuff, or final design and construction, all that's to be determined at this point. And with that I'll take any questions you may have.

Sorg: Thank you Wyatt. That was really good. Any questions from the Committee? Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Wyatt. I do have a, a couple of questions or requests I guess. Next week I'm actually headed to TxDOT to meet with them to discuss the Northeast Parkway ...

Kartchner: Okay.

Doolittle: Corridor Study. So I'm just wondering, the 404 connection, did the data that's included in this modeling consider the Northeast Parkway?

Kartchner: I believe it did.

Paz: Under the 2040, yes. The 2040 is part of ...

Sorg: Could you state your name please.

Paz: Oh, I'm sorry. Jerry Paz with Molzen Corbin, also worked with Wyatt on this project. On the 2040 the Northeast Parkway is part of the El Paso's long-range thoroughfare plan so we're, that assumption was built into, to that number.

Doolittle: Okay. Mr. Chair I do have one more request specifically of, of the Molzen Corbin folks. This Committee, or this Board has been very interested in this, this corridor. Looking at your schedule we're expected to have the Phase B draft in November with the public meeting that same month. I

just ask you to keep us and maybe Tom for the MPO staff informed so that we can present that information to the Board so that they're aware of when they can attend the public meetings and provide their input as either an elected official or as you know personally, just because of the interests of the Board themselves. And I'll try to do the same on my, on my monthly meetings but more specifically I guess I would ask of you and Tom just kind of keep the Board in the loop so that the Board knows when to participate in those meetings and give their input.

Kartchner: Mr. Chair, Mr. Doolittle. We also have in here which we didn't show on the schedule a preliminary draft report which we're going to come out with probably the end of June and we can make sure that you guys get a copy of that and, and we'd be happy to come back and present as the project progresses.

Doolittle: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Very good. Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for the presentation. I only observed one particular item that was not addressed and that is the UAS. Did you consult with NMSU regarding, that entire area is UAS. Was that considered?

Hancock: In the phase, or excuse me Mr. Chair. No it, it wasn't in the first Phase A report. It will be in this next phase.

Hancock: I see. Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Would someone explain what a UAS is?

Hancock: The Physical Sciences Department at NMSU um has that entire area uh designated as a Unmanned Aerial Flight Area and so it has particular restrictions that could be um problematic.

Sorg: Understand.

Hancock: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Councilor Pedroza.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm going to sound a little bit, well I don't know a lot of this stuff. Can you tell me who the stakeholders that you have identified, what, what, what groups, it's not just "Y'all come!" Who in particular has been targeted to be at, and, and identified as stakeholders for these meetings?

Kartchner: Mr. Chair, Ms. Pedroza. The stakeholders have included people from Dona Ana County, the Sunland Park ...

Pedroza: People from, just residents of?

Kartchner: No.

Pedroza: No.

Kartchner: The employees from Dona Ana County.

Pedroza: I see.

Kartchner: We've had border crossing individuals, we've had a group from Mexico. We had the trucking industry, Border Patrol. Who else?

Paz: We have, the NMDOT Borders Office has a list of about 120 stakeholders that they collaborate with on a number of border projects that are going on in the area. So they include the Border Trade Alliance, they include all the people at Customs, INS, all the law enforcement individuals they, and the trucking industry's a big element in that in, in terms of their, their use and they're the ones that came forward on a 3P alternative which was, it came from them at some of our previous stakeholder meetings. So that was kind of interesting that, that the private sector has expressed an interest in them building the road and, and taking on that responsibility cause they saw the benefit. And so once the traffic numbers came back it, it kind of shed light that well maybe there is a demand because we went into this not knowing if there was a demand and, and how much of a demand and who would use it and, and so as the traffic numbers started to come in it started to shed light on the things that we were hearing at these public meetings, these stakeholder meetings about a, a need for that.

Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: And mostly in a westward direction so that was, that was you know something we learned through the course of the study but there's about 128 border industry/border groups, again staff from both El Paso, Las Cruces that, that are collaborated with that.

Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: And we can get you a full list of the, our ...

Pedroza: Thank you.

Paz: Of the stakeholders list.

Pedroza: I would appreciate that. Again I'm only familiar with 404 where it intersects I-10 and goes in one direction towards Chaparral and the other direction toward, through, through ...

Kartchner: Anthony.

Pedroza: Not really. It goes north of Anthony. But so is that what we're talking about or, or then they talked about something about Anthony and, or gave me the impression that you were going north of Las Cruces. Does that, you're not talking, I was probably mistaken. It doesn't go north of Las Cruces.

Kartchner: Mr., Mr. Chair.

Pedroza: Right.

Kartchner: The, as you can see on the alignments here there's the, this turquoise alignment, the blue alignment, and this red alignment all would connect to I-10 west of Las Cruces. The, this 404 connection here would actually connect to the 404 interchange which takes you to Chaparral. It would go through, across the river and then it would tie into what is O'Hare Road now.

Pedroza: Oh, okay.

Kartchner: Which is, I believe is a county facility that would have to obviously be upgraded, and then it would go through O'Hare Road as it changes from O'Hare Road to NM-404 at NM-478 and then ties all the way to the interchange at NM-404 to I-10.

Pedroza: Is there any thinking about routing some of that through the actual City of Las Cruces?

Kartchner: If that alternative was chosen that traffic would go on I-10 through Las Cruces.

Pedroza: It would.

Kartchner: Yes ma'am. Current, like it currently does now. Any traffic that currently uses Artcraft Road, they get on I-10 ...

Pedroza: Right.

Kartchner: In El Paso ...

Pedroza: Right.

Kartchner: And then they take I-10 ...

Pedroza: Yeah.

Kartchner: West, so it would be ...

Pedroza: Then ...

Kartchner: Similar. It would just connect in Anthony.

Pedroza: So then my question would be to you or, or possibly to Tom: In, in terms of some of those residents that I had kind of been saying, "Oh, we don't need to have residents. What do they know?" Believe me, but if it does go through Las Cruces then I think, suspect that staff will need to somehow or another connect with plain old ordinary residents as to what their opinion of, of these alternatives might be. Is that a possibility?

Paz: Yes. And, and ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: To back up a little bit Councilor Pedroza, so in El Paso they have what they call like the Inner Loop, so it's Transmountain Road ...

Pedroza: Right.

Paz: Loop 375, and it goes around El Paso. Now they're building that Outer Loop which is that one that's on that I don't know billion-dollar project that's connecting the Outer Loop of El Paso. Well that Outer Loop would then tie into 404 because the, the grade on Transmountain Road is too steep for truckers. They don't like it. And so going through the Anthony Gap is much smoother and much easier, and so they're looking at if, if, see Texas does this a lot. They have the Inner Loop, they have the Outer Loop. I think Houston has some, you know three or four loops.

Pedroza: And very confusing too.

Paz: So this'll be El Paso's Outer Loop so the 404 as, as Trent mentioned, what they're calling their Northeast Parkway alignment is the Outer Loop to El Paso so it, it would be in, in terms of system connectivity and that criteria, it would really match up with the goals of the region that are being developed down there. With respect to the other alternatives as, as Wyatt had mentioned, oops. Which way am I going? So this Alternate E which

ties into Corralitos, what, what we were finding, what came out of the results and it just kind of startled us is you're seeing that large volume of trucks that are heading to California. They're not wanting to stop in El Paso, they're not wanting to stop in Anthony, they're wanting to get, they save 30 minutes going through El Paso, going around and going, and heading off west. So you're looking at a large volume of traffic that would simply bypass Las Cruces altogether and it would take that congestion off the local roads, I-10 and, and, and others and it would, it would ship it towards the west. So that's, that's that concept there. So there would be less of an impact on Las Cruces unless you're a hotel owner. They want that business to sit here and come in Las Cruces. But you're you're talking about truckers that are long-haul, I mean they're, they're ready to get going, they're ready to move so how many of them would actually stay the night in Las Cruces versus El Paso or all that stuff so those are things that are difficult to determine. But, but that's what we're finding; 404 would, it has the least amount of vehicles on it, it's more of a regional corridor. It's meant to circulate traffic around the region. And so as you're seeing that it's probably, it's, the truckers probably use Artcraft Road, get on I-10, and go just like they always have, less of an incentive to use the 404 than they would be if they saved 30 minutes heading, heading on the west side. So those are the dynamics. We're kind of learning as we get deeper into this that's happening with this travel. So traffic you know when, when people set up a Dunkin' Donuts they look for the busiest ...

Pedroza: Sure.

Paz: Most congested, worst street you can find and that's where they want to be. So traffic, it depends on who you're talking to whether it's good or bad.

Pedroza: What, how did you get the totals that you have there on, on that particular slide? The, the, in Alternative E resulted in 12,780. Is, those are not real numbers, that's just like projections or something?

Paz: Projections. Your staff would like you to believe that there is this scientific black box that all these inputs ...

Pedroza: You know how they are.

Paz: Are put into and out spits these you know genuine numbers and, and if we could guess the future boy we'd be in the stock market not in traffic demand. But it is a very scientific, educated, very thought-out wild guess.

Pedroza: It's a good crystal ball.

Paz: Crystal ball. And, and I don't know if you can explain it any better Tom, but it, it's very scientific. What goes into it, the character of the drivers, the character of the truckers ...

Pedroza: Oh, geeze.

Paz: They interview ...

Pedroza: Ask their wives.

Paz: People at the border crossing, say, "Where do you want to go?" And so the origin and destination and the, the travel demand is all predicted based on, and then they count cars all over the streets and they're seeing if their model matches the numbers they're physically counting on today so they calibrate their model based on today's traffic and say, "Okay if it, if it matches more or less what we see today," then they growth it up to see what would happen in the future. So these ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: How they code their, their driver characteristic makes a difference, so there's a lot of variables that go into it and, and ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Paz: A long time ago we took a step back and said, "Let's, let these experts who that's all they do," Bob Shull's out of Washington State. We've used him and this, he's a DOT expert for their statewide program and, and they're used by the MPO here so we've, we've long ago just collaborated with him to help develop these numbers and then you sit there and scratch your head and say, "Well, that makes no more sense, I mean that's kind of crazy." And as he explains these, these things about the Outer Loop/Inner Loop of El Paso you're talking about a local situation versus long-haul truckers that want to get through.

Pedroza: Okay. Thank you very much.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Oh, dear. Mayor Barraza first and then Commissioner Hancock.

Barraza: Okay. Mine's a simple question or a concern. I think I've been on MPO for quite a few years and when this project was first brought up, I think the major concern was the economic development of Las Cruces and the Town of Mesilla where all this traffic was going to be routed around uh the,

the City of Las Cruces and I don't know if that's something that had been discussed or what is the opinion on that.

Sorg: May I suggest uh that, and you can back me up or tell me I'm wrong but this traffic is going to go to the border, the Mexico border so it would affect that. Yes, it would affect that, that traffic that might be coming to, in and out of the border at Santa Teresa but as far as traffic that comes through and around and in El Paso that shouldn't be affected. They're not going to go way over there as a rule, I would think. Back me up or tell me down.

Kartchner: Mr., Mr. Chairman, Mayor. One of the things that people had concerns about was if somebody that's going from California to Florida, that they would take this road and bypass Las Cruces altogether. The traffic model that we have can predict that and what they determined was it's not going to save them any time to do that and so they didn't see any traffic that was going from either Florida to California or vice-versa that would actually use this corridor to, to skip Las Cruces. It may have an impact in that 12,000 vehicles aren't routed through Las Cruces. I believe our traffic model can predict the number of traffic, or number of cars or trucks that would actually stop in Las Cruces and I, I believe we had them do that. I don't remember what the, the result of that was but it was a very low percentage of people that would actually stop in Las Cruces. But we can, that's one of the things that we've been concerned about. We had hotel owners at our first public meeting that were very concerned about, about that and so we're going to continue to investigate that and see if we can't get a, a number as to what that impact would be.

Paz: The other thing that I think was calibrated in this model is previous predictive models overestimated traffic so there was, there was high volumes that were predicted in the past that never materialized. And so this, this model took that into consideration. But overall what we did see is a continuous increase in travel all over the region and so you're not going to lose any traffic or any visitors to the Town of Mesilla that you don't, you currently have. You're going to see a growth in travel, in visitors. But there may be a slight, slightly lower growth with this, with this bypass road than there would've been without it. So there, there's not a decline in number of people going through the town and the area at all but there is a, it, it could be that there's a less grow, lower growth than there would've normally been.

Sorg: Thank you Jerry, thank you Wyatt. Mr. Hancock.

Hancock: What, what is that current number?

Sorg: What number?

Hancock: The, he mentioned there, there was, there were projections that were um way too high so that must mean that we have a current number.

Paz: Well that's the other element that make, makes this unique. A lot of, like when we did the I-10 project you count the cars and then you can growth it out from a baseline. There's no road out there to count cars on so everything is predictive. But what was, like NM-136 that ties into the border crossing, some of that travel that was predicted early on did not materialize and so of, of all the vehicles that are coming through at this point it's, it's less, lower on the growth curve than, than people had predicted. And I think that was, I think we saw with the housing slow-down in the, in 2009 there was all these growth projections that were way out there and, and they just didn't happen and so that could be a phenomenon that occurred nationwide that happened here. But I think this model has calibrated itself for that for a more realistic forward growth.

Hancock: But wouldn't we be looking at what the current volume is on I-10 now?

Paz: The volume on I-10, the 66,000 or so vehicles that are on there now are, are, would continue to again as I mentioned to the Mayor, would continue to grow and there's plenty of capacity on I-10 to handle all of this additional traffic. So the, the capacity of I-10 is not the bottleneck. It's the savings in time, would, would anybody use a brand-new corridor and, and how much, and that's what these numbers are predicting. But ...

Hancock: I, I understand.

Paz: I-10 has the capacity.

Hancock: I, I, we, the reason I'm asking the question is because I'm just cross-referencing the numbers. South Central Regional Transit has a, a study underway currently on rail between Las, between Las Cruces and El Paso and our consultant, our traffic engineer indicates that there are 41,000 trips between El Paso and Las Cruces every day. And that, that means that it's on the I-10 before you hit I-25 down to El Paso. So 41,000 minus 12,700 or ...

Paz: No, it would, the, I think if, if I'm hearing you correctly, like I had two of those this, one over and one back so I had two this morning to El Paso and so I think that it's those daily trips that people take to and from El Paso that that's counting because ...

Hancock: Okay.

Paz: I believe there's more than 45,000 currently volume of cars on I-10. So it, I-10 has plenty of capacity to add the 12,000 if that's what the study would, would, would come down to.

Hancock: Well it, the, the reason I ask is that, that there about the middle on I-10 between El Paso and Las Cruces we have the weigh station and every, every truck that goes through is counted. So we have an, we have an accurate count of how many trucks there currently are between El Paso. So that means that we have, we don't count them going to El Paso, we count them coming from El Paso. So the, in that route that would be the number that may very well be bypassed, or some portion thereof. So it, the ones that are not going to be taking 25 going north that are going to go west, then that's, that's a real number that can be identified. Because if you, if you look on both sides you have a weigh station over here at, between El Paso and Las Cruces and then you have Customs which counts every one of them also on I-10. So you, you can tell the difference between these two and the number of trucks is going to be the ones that went up I-25, and then you have another, you have another Customs up on 25 that, those three should add up so if they don't that means they went to Las Cruces and dropped a load and then went back.

Sorg: Or Commissioner they could've been traveling from Houston to Phoenix.

Hancock: Well you would count those then on, on 10.

Sorg: Right.

Hancock: Right. So you're going to know one way or another where they are and ...

Sorg: Right.

Hancock: And on which load, whether it is the west load or whether it is the north load. So it, that's going to tell you very likely what the, the volume, the true number is going to be for this one.

Paz: The, the ...

Sorg: But if you're traveling ...

Hancock: Except for the stuff ...

Sorg: From Houston to Phoenix ...

Hancock: Coming from the east.

Paz: Yeah.

Sorg: You wouldn't go over there ...

Paz: Right.

Sorg: To Santa Teresa ...

Hancock: Yeah.

Sorg: And go up.

Hancock: No. No. No.

Sorg: Not necessarily.

Paz: But what ...

Hancock: Well, you'd come up 10.

Sorg: Yeah.

Hancock: Yeah.

Paz: But what this is showing is those 12,000 vehicles would be taken off of I-10.

Hancock: Right.

Paz: They, they would be removed from I-10 and put on this corridor. So, but as I mentioned to the Mayor I-10 is still increasing in its volume of trucks. So, so the region is, is increasing all together at a lower rate and it would be 12,000 less vehicles which is, which to me was shocking. I, I thought if it got up to four or 5,000 initially just kind of growing up here if I thought four or 5,000. That, that, that road's not going to get that much use. I was, when I saw six, 12,000 I was kind of shocked.

Hancock: Yeah. Well I think the numbers Mr. Chair in, in the Transit Study um indicated um that to add another lane onto I-10 in that section is $6.5 million a mile. So if you don't have to add a lane there and you're building it over here to bypass then the roads are going to last a lot longer.

Sorg: Oh yes.

Hancock: So thank you.

Paz: The, I think the, well the other startling point Commissioner was, and this was before we got the numbers, when the trucking industry approached us about the public/private partnership saying, "We'll build it if there's a way to recoup our money," and, and it would be a County led type of project because I do think the Constitution prohibits the State from taking on that task. However the, like many things in our Constitution they, they delegate activities to local governments and so I think that, and, and we've asked our Project Development Engineer from the DOT to get a legal opinion on even is that a possibility but when you think why would, you mean you're willing to put your private dollars in to fund this because they, they felt like there was that demand for it so it, it, it keeps coming back and, and then once we got the numbers I, I could see where they could make some money if they, if they really materialize the 12,000. And it would also be on their risk. You know if they charged a dollar maybe 12,000 users, if they charge $15 people go I-10 and, and save that money. I think we calculated the gas alone would be you know 12, 15 bucks so I mean there's that point where they're going to say, "I'm, I'm going to take it and pay that toll and, and keep going on." So that there's, there's that element in it but it seemed having $100 million, if you make it concrete $120 million project, those projects don't come around very often or the funding for those are just not available unless there was some sort of private investment. So that, that was just a thought that we would ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Paz: What we're exploring as a part of this.

Sorg: We understand, Jerry.

Hancock: Mr., Mr. Chair. I'm, I'm, as he's saying that I'm thinking okay if that's the County issue then, then I'm wondering if we could use the infrastructure development zone as the, the means for that.

Sorg: I don't know what an infrastructure ...

Hancock: IDZ.

Sorg: Development zone ...

Hancock: Remember the IDZ?

Sorg: IDZ, okay. Perhaps ...

Pedroza: Yeah. And I would, I would caution, oh may ...

Sorg: Go ahead Councilor.

Pedroza: I would caution you not only with the Infrastructure Development Zone because that has implications of non-local government but I would also caution you to listen very, very carefully to what your legal advisors tell you about whether a private/private or a county or some other entity within a county is, is totally exempt from the Constitution because I suspect they're not. Thank you.

Sorg: Okay. Councilor Eakman.

Eakman: Two small points. In looking at these alternatives and this is based on what is happening currently, if somebody were to enter Alternative B at Jackrabbit Lane and going west they'd still have a three-mile grade to climb. If they entered at Corralitos all the other traffic would be dealing with merging huge semi trailers at a 75-mile-an-hour rate when they're actually doing 85. Where, whereas the Airport interchange the grade is complete and you're at a 65-mile-an-hour zone. And so today I favor public safety as an option here.

Sorg: Thank you Councilor. I, I had one thing I wanted to bring up as long as, if you could just move to the solar zone map and I just wanted to comment that I would imagine the solar zone is going to have to deal with the UAS's too, issue, but I, I, I don't have my glasses on but I wonder if, if you could outline on there where the new national monument boundaries are. Not necessarily right now and show us, have future maps have those boundaries on it so everybody when you go to stakeholders, etc. um they know where the national monument is. And one stakeholder will be the Friends of the Organ Mountains Desert Peaks National Monument. You will need to contact them.

Kartchner: Correct.

Sorg: So yeah, it's going to be important. There's going, it may or may not affect, there might be an impact, may not, probably not, probably, anybody would, we need to know.

Kartchner: Yeah, Commissioner, Chairman. We, we did look at that. I will add that to the other maps. It is on um the west side of the railroad tracks from what I understand and so we'll make sure that it doesn't impact that. That was one of the first things that I thought of when we revised this project ...

Sorg: Sure.

Kartchner: Was, "Oh boy, what does that do to it? Does it just ...

Sorg: Yeah.

Kartchner: Shut it down completely?" so ...

Sorg: And you might want to expand the maps, all of them, to show the 404 crossing the valley and connecting ...

Kartchner: Correct.

Sorg: Up with I-10 and 404, 404.

Kartchner: Yeah, we, we need to look at the, that's one of the alternatives. We have a lot of work to, to do to see what impacts it will have to the, crossing the river.

Sorg: Yeah.

Kartchner: All the private properties and then that area between NM-478/NM-460 on O'Hare Road is kind of a residential area that's pretty narrow and so ...

Sorg: Sure.

Kartchner: How do we accommodate the traffic through there?

Sorg: Very good. Last words by anybody? Go ahead Jerry.

Paz: Yeah, I would just add that um as we concluded up our Phase A, Commissioner Garrett was the one that brought up the 404 and I, I wish he were here today but, and, and its relationship to the overall circulation within the regional area and the system connectivity that's going on there and it made, it made a lot of sense and so we went to the Department of Transportation and, and added that to our Phase B study so that we could look at it in more detail. And, and that's how that one got kind of added on at the very end of our Phase A study.

Sorg: Very ...

Paz: By, we, we did an amendment to our Phase A study to add that into it.

Sorg: Okay. Very good.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Yes Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. Just to kind of close the loop, that's part of the reason, you know I appreciate all of y'all's comments but that's part of the reason that

my initial comments were, were brought up related to this, the Phase B report and the public meetings is you know I'm sure that Wyatt and Molzen will, will hear your comments and try to implement them but I can't stress enough that most of y'all's entities are represented as stakeholders. They'll be participating as staff but I, I can't stress enough the importance of having representation from your different groups and even you personally in these public meetings so that ...

Sorg: Absolutely.

Doolittle: We can address those formally but I appreciate your comments as part of the Board and ...

Sorg: Sure.

Doolittle: Look forward to working for this, this part of the study.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. That's well, well said. Okay.

Paz: Thank you.

7.2 Committee Training

Sorg: Are we ready for the next Discussion Item which is 7.2: Committee Training?

McAdams: Commissioner Sorg, Councilor Sorg and Committee Members. I would like to discuss about the - not that. Where's the thing to get it off? I'd like to discuss about, hold on. Yeah. That's what I want. I'd like to discuss about the MPO structure and process, and many of you *(inaudible)* we have a lot of new Members and so I'd like to sort of briefly, this is the, really the structure is what we, we use to do all the things we're doing now. Without it we would have, basically we'd be shooting from the hip I think. If you look at the connection, transportation's the glue for the communities. It connects work, shopping, recreation, medical, social trips, and how people get to their destination, maybe by various modes. A MPO's a vehicle and framework, we can see it today to coordinate transportation projects to serve the needs of the people of the planning area. And what we were seeing is democracy in action, being deliberate and transparent and inclusive. And these are really the hallmarks of a innovative and successful MPO.

And before we get into the meat of the thing, we are dealing with complex, chaotic, fractal, and problem, and problems and solutions that are wicked which means that they're wicked in the sense that they're almost impossible to give solutions and also impossible to solve. The problems are wicked, the solutions are wicked you can see here and

sometime when you think you're causing, you're solving one problem you cause another. And I think we all bear that responsibility.

Let's go back, sort of talk about what is an MPO and some of this may be new, hopefully not to most of you. And a Metropolitan Planning Organization's a federally designated decision-making body which for planning, funding, coordination for all projects within its area, our planning area. And the, you see the map on the right-hand side. Here's our planning area, or Dona Ana County and the red outline is our planning area. Mesilla Valley MPO's the, is the multijurisdictional agency responsible for regional transportation organization, or, by, designated by the State of New Mexico. If you look at, and I'm, these are actual, I can sort of give you interpretations that are actual things within our plan which are, are authorization for that process. We are federally designated by, by law. And if you look at the authority for the MPO comes from the Code of Federal Register which say here's what, how we are given authority. First any, any MPO that's more than 50,000: 1) Any urbanized area which needs contiguous development gets an MPO and then after that the government, the governor of the state, in our case the Governor of New Mexico goes to the general, the jurisdictions and say, "We'd like to have you form an MPO." And so the body we have now was established in the '80s to, really to, as designated by the Federal Government and by the, by the State of New Mexico to do transportation planning for this area. That's why it's very important of course. And we further, so this is kind of the authority, but then, within the structure of course you have the bylaws and the Joint Powers Act so implemented that so our bylaws well say that the MPO is established by the Joint Powers Act which is agreement after the MPO's established and by the designated Governor of New Mexico and contract between the City of Las Cruces and New Mexico and Video-T and others, also the Town of Mesilla and the County. And the MPO's purpose is to carry out the urban transportation planning process as defined within these provisions.

You look at our decision making, we have three bodies: Of course yourselves and we'll discuss it a little bit later; the MPO, the MPO Policy Committee is comprised of elected officials from the City of Las Cruces, Town of Mesilla, Dona Ana County, and NMDOT and you see all the, listed are the, your, and, *(inaudible)* your bodies listed on the, the top. The MPO Technical Advisory Committee is composed of support staff from regional agencies who help evaluate the transportation and give advice. They are *(inaudible)* by the Policy Committee to serve you in your, in your efforts. And then also the Technical, the, the BPAC or the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee is composed of agencies and also citizens to aid the Policy Committee and the Technical Committee in looking at bicycle issues and pedestrian issues.

What are the products? We know a lot of the products. Our, the three major products we do, we're going to talk, we've already talked about one very recently about three, four months ago was the

transportation plan that's for a 20-year period and it's updated every five years. Then the T, the TIP is looking at obligated which means financially constrained project when you have to have money to do them for the next five years, they all have federal funds in. And right now you know we're updating the TIP for two years' basis but we know we can also update it when necessary as well. Unified Work, Planning, Work, Shop, Work Program that Tom will be discussing is basically what the task we'll be undertaking in the next two years as well. So these are our major, we have other things we do too, studies like the stuff we did at Missouri Avenue, or Missouri Avenue and with Valley, *(inaudible)* Valley but with other things we look at for studies in the meantime so.

What is the role of the Policy Committee? And this comes directly from the Federal Register, for the Code of Federal Register and mean that you're, this body is responsible, well given the task for MP, for planning, transportation planning. It's designated for each urbanized area for develop a comprehensive multimodal and when you see that even more so now than in the past, transportation planning process including the development of the plan and the TIP. Now we also say also is involved in that is the UWP, the Work Program as well. For it encourages efficient and safe and management and serving the mobility people and freight including accessibility, pedestrian walking, bicycles, public transportation, growth and development, and minimizing also fuel consumption air pollution. That's pretty big, that's a big task but I think y'all doing just fine and of course the details are, I think the, the devil's in the details certain degree in that we do do a very deliberate process and you're overwhelmed.

So we're looking at these three items that are, are, what's your purpose. And the Technical Committee is really your support group. We, the, looks at there, is established by the Policy Committee and responsible for looking at technical review of the transportation plans within the urban area and the urbanized areas that we urbanize the area, and then put to the Policy Committee on issues directed by the Membership or brought up from the other region like the, your, your staff, or other staff, the MPO with that, would say this is something that the Policy Committee should know of too. So they're, it both works way, yeah, both work way. And so other responsibilities include as designated by the Policy Committee, so of course if you want the Technical Committee to study an item and stuff you can, right. And so it's really your body to, to use as you will.

The pedestrian, the Bicycle and, and Pedestrian Advisory Committee was established, well fairly recently but again established by the Policy Committee. Everything's established by the Policy Committee under their directions and their authority and really the, the Pedestrian Committee, BPAC we will sort of shorten it a little bit is responsible for looking at design implementation of all bicycle and pedestrian facilities. We, we just recently look at a multi, completion of the lower part of the multi-use path and a lot of issues too as well. And so again it's, it's, it's a

unique committee because it's composed both citizen advisors and also public officials, right. And so it's really for education, looking at facilities, and anything related to it. And these are also outlined in the bylaws.

If you look at what is the MPO staff, myself, Tom and Andrew and Zach, it's develop, we are, we're, we're often considered the workhorses of the, of the Committee. We develop the, the TIP. We do the MTP with your assistance well and the UWP and provide data and analysis for monitoring existing transportation systems, one thing we said we're involved in the travel demand model which we're working with several agencies on that, and short- and long, long-term transportation planning needs, and to facilitate regional forum for various agencies. While we are not a implementing agency ourself, we open ourselves to issues that are, are regional in transportation, in pedestrian, bicycles, public transportation, highways. So we, we hope we facilitate and that's where our mission, to facilitate discussion and not to dictate, that's the way we feel, but to really bring together everybody in a forum that's rational we hope, and calm and deliberate. Make participating agencies aware of funding opportunities although we do not, we not, we don't do grants, we want everybody to be aware of them regardless of town, county, state, well state knows, anybody, public transportation so they know the, the opportunities out there. With the TAP funds it's pretty well, like it right now in looking at different applications from various authorities and processing them too. So we want, as a staff we want everybody to get full opportunity to fund, federal funding. Provide direct planning assistance to RoadRUNNER Transit so we are, the staff are, are the official representatives of RoadRUNNER Transit for our, for the planning so we do the short-range transit plan recently and we're also doing some maps etc. and the new routes. And plug, plug, plug, we hope in July that the RoadRUNNER will be starting the new services. Example of something very short-term where we could plan for it and immediately we see results of the, often planning is not that way. You see results 20 years from the time you start planning. And of course we coordinate meetings and, on all levels and meetings on technical policy and BPAC and that's also one of our function too, to make sure everything's running smoothly so when you get here you don't have to worry, right.

In conclusion this process is a very dynamic and innovative planning process. The cogs of transportation planning are sometimes seem to move very slowly for citizens and sometimes for ourselves too, right. How, that's the nature of planning, right. Where we're doing expensive project, million dollars, $10 million projects and once you do them you can't reverse them can you, you can't just tear up a bypass, you just can't tear up a road or interchange. They are very serious decisions. And so looking at, well actually we say it, this is democracy and involving several stakeholders and we think about it, it should be a deliberate. It shouldn't be by fiat, you know it should be involving public officials, other

stakeholders so everybody's aware and so we can get a better process we hope.

Everyone on the MPO including those in committees and staff have a tremendous responsibility. We all, we always have sometime we get caught up in the, in the maze I think, but I think we also have to get out of the, the maze or the vortex and realize that we have a responsibility to our citizens as well, to make sure that the, the mobility is granted for all. You know a lot of time we talk about automobiles but all, we often forget mobility for pedestrians, for those that have mobility problems I think, and that's one of the things that has shifted in the last 30 years you see. Before pedestrians and bicycles and public transportation were sort of aside but now they come to the forefront and I think that as our population becomes older, our mobility issue become even greater. So economic equity is also important too I think to make sure that people have mobility so they can get to jobs. Of course that's more public transportation, bicycle but we also remember that, that it's just not cars, it's just not people that to provide econ, to provide economic equity and job opportunities requires a different way of looking at things, right. And equality of life for all citizens, just making roads and just expanding things because you have capacity problems we know is not the way to have a good quality environment, it really has multimodal and you look at the, really the, the, the by, how we get people to our area is not because we're moving people fast through them. It's because the quality of life we're generating, right and that's why places, people in Colorado, other places move to us, new to them, perhaps not to other places. So it's just not moving people fast through the area but providing a good quality of life. We have an MPO structure and process that's decades old, not only decades old here but decades old across the United States which has served for many, many years very well as a engine for change and for a, a forum that's unique. There's probably not any regional organization that has lasted as long as the MPO for planning purposes. I think it's good to 50 years old and our mission is to assure that these, we use these elements wisely to assist our communities to prosper and move forward for the wellbeing of all citizens. Thank you very much. Chairman Sorg do we have any questions?

Sorg: Sure. Any questions by the ...

McAdams: Yes.

Sorg: Any questions by the Commissioner, the Committee? Mr. Hancock.

Hancock: Thank you. How do we get something on the TIP?

McAdams: The TIP is through your, we petition through the MPO. You'll put this, you know the, you're, you're an implementing agency and you would say,

"Here's where we can have federal funds," you would coordinate with the DOT and also then just talk to Andrew about this too, as well. If you, if you know you going to, but is this a ways to a particular question about …

Hancock: Well we need to get the, the exchange at Spaceport Road on the TIP. We don't have it on the TIP.

McAdams: Is that …

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hancock. That particular interchange is outside of the MPO's boundaries so that would be, the process you'd go is to get it on the, on the RTIPer through the Regional Transportation Planning Organization and then they can work with NMDOT to get that onto the STIP.

McAdams: Right.

Sorg: I believe we've talked to the R, RTD too, on that. The RTO.

McAdams: RTO, Jay Armijo but probably a …

Sorg: Right.

McAdams: Person *(inaudible)*. Yeah.

Sorg: She was here and we told her all about it.

McAdams: Right. Okay.

Sorg: So she, they're aware of it.

McAdams: Yeah.

Sorg: It's in their hands I guess really. Are, are we …

Hancock: Thank you.

Sorg: Back to saying that.

McAdams: But we wish we could help you but I think this, it, we just got it before. There's a good reason for separating the RTPO …

Hancock: Right.

McAdams: And the MPO and, and the El Paso, the two MPOs too so even though it's not convenient sometimes I think well we don't want M, El Paso to be messing with our stuff and they won't, and vice versa.

Sorg: Yes.

McAdams: Or us messing with the RTPO too. So there's a ...

Hancock: Right.

McAdams: Although it's frustrating sometimes I think it works, it's very much advantage to all parties you know.

Sorg: Right. Well there, there still has to be cooperation though ...

McAdams: Oh.

Sorg: Between the different POs.

McAdams: Yes there are. We can comment, we can comment about this ...

Sorg: Right.

McAdams: Job and if they come for advice we could probably tell you how it's going to impact.

Sorg: Yeah.

McAdams: But we cannot, we don't have any direct ...

Sorg: Right.

McAdams: Authority to judge or make decisions.

Sorg: Right. I remind the Committee about our ...

McAdams: Right.

Sorg: MOU with the El Paso ...

McAdams: Right.

Sorg: MPO. Okay?

McAdams: Okay.

Hancock: Thank you.

Sorg: Any other questions? Comments? Okay. Thank you very much.

McAdams: Thank you Chairman Sorg, thank, thank the Committee.

7.3 Federal Fiscal Year 2017 and 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Sorg: And now we go on to 7.3, the item that was moved in the agenda, the Unified Action, Work Planning, or Unified Planning Work Program.

Murphy: The ...

Sorg: Mr. Murphy.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Chair. The Unified Planning Work Program or UPWP for short is our two-year work program, identifies tasks, connectivities that mainly MPO staff would be working on. I had it moved from the Action, the Action Item, Action Agenda because in, upon reviewing the State's Planning Procedures Manual we're not, we're not scheduled to adopt it until the, your June meeting.

Sorg: Okay.

Murphy: So we'll just have a discussion on this, give me more time to look for typos and everything in it, and get further input. But it is posted on our website for public com, for public review and comment and, and public comments always can be given to any MPO staff member. This pretty much put, outlines, outlines the timetable for the adoption of it. As I said I, I recently remembered upon reviewing it that we're not supposed to adopt it till next month and then it'll go into effect at, on October 1st, the beginning of the federal fiscal year.

It's organized as an introduction where it, it, introduction gives background on the MPO, what, what committees we have, very, various other information. The meat of the document is in Section 2 which is the Work Program Tasks which are divided up into five task areas. This is consistent among MPOs throughout the state so we're following um an, we're following an adopted format in that.

Task 1 probably handles a, a big majority and big part of what we do is the administration, getting ready meeting materials, getting, putting in advertising for the meetings, putting together trainings for staff and for, for yourselves, maintaining a website, conducting our public participation, and coordinating with state and federal agencies.

Task 2, um something that you probably see every, every quarter here, we work on the TIP, we amend the TIP, we get, get different

projects, changing and adding and coming onto it and then each year we do a report of what has been obligated.

Task 3, general development data collection analysis, I think through recent federal, federal transportation authorizations, this is the, this really becomes the meat of the transportation planning process. This is, you know collecting the data in the, in the past year and hopefully continuing on. We've been identifying ways in which to gather data for what we want to measure. We're looking at, at ways to, to count pedestrians, count bicycles, count transit users, better ways of, of counting our vehicles. In our traffic count program the last few years we've recently added the capability to, that we, every count that we do we have an, we do a classification count so we know what percentage of trucks that are driving on our roadways and, and all that information gets used and it ultimate, you know it's used in various things like the transportation model Mr. Kartchner referred to in his presentation. So we collect data to help, help us, help us do the planning process.

Task 4, generally aligned with the general transportation planning, the maintaining of our Metropolitan Transportation Plan, if we have any amendments for that. The discussions we've had on the Trail Plan would be an MTP amendment so we'd have the work under, under that. We're also going to be working under this work item on a coordinated human services and transportation plan, help identify opportunities where human services agencies can combine leverage or even just coordinate their transportation dollars to help, help serve, help serve the people, people in need you know transportation to and from medical services. We also do safety planning in this, we coordinate with the schools so their, the Safe Routes to School, and we also, we also provide staff, on the staff report we'll make maps. We'll, we'll give assistance to the Regional Transit District, help them out in their planning efforts.

Task 5 is where we have a specific item, items that are, are large enough to be called out on their own. Our participation in the Regional Leadership Consortium is, is proposed to be continued. We're going to continue in a lot of the data collection, good points towards this is developing an asset and safety management plan. We have requested through the state some extra funding to conduct participatory mapping. That's a, a citizen, a citizen-level activity where hopefully we'll be able to work with some, with some group that'll be on the ground with citizens and they'll be mapping their transportation concerns, and we'll be able to map that and use that to help identify needed projects within the area. And then last time we, we talked about this at, here Members of the Committee suggested we take a look at what's happening in the A Mountain, A Mountain area. We've also requested some additional monies from NMDOT to conduct that study and then we got a couple other items if we need to, if something else crops up we can amend into the UPWP.

Like I said we'll be taking, come, we'll be refining the document based on any input we receive moving forward and we'll bring this back to

your June meeting for, for your, hopefully for your adoption which will then transmit to the DOT, have included in the Statewide Work Program, approval by FHWA, and then begin implement, or begin working on this program October 1st. And with that I'll stand for any questions.

Sorg: Some questions? Councilor Pedroza and then Mr. Doolittle.

Pedroza: Thank you Mr. Chair. Tom do you regularly attend the El Paso MPO meetings?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Councilor Pedroza. Yes. MPO staff attends the, the El Paso meeting each month and most times we, we do a, a summary sheet in your packet.

Wray: Mr., Mr. Chair. I was not able to attend the meeting in April. That's why there's no report this month.

Pedroza: Oh. Okay. Okay. So ...

Murphy: But most times someone from our office is there.

Pedroza: And how do you, besides, it, is it just the page summarizing what they were discussing or, or is there some other way that you can let us know if there's anything that should be of interest to us being discussed un, in that forum?

Murphy: We think the best manner of is we provide the page of what's ...

Pedroza: Okay.

Murphy: Been discussed and, and of course if we think, if we think anything rises to the, to that level we'll certainly bring it up but this, providing you the summary allows you to, to look at it and say, "Hey can you find me more information on this," you know Subject A or Subject B and then at that point we can do it. We also do have you know regular communication with the El Paso MPO staff as, you know it's, you know I ...

Pedroza: I remember that we had been discussing whether or not there should be some kind of a, a meeting ground or some, some sort of cooperation between Mesilla Valley MPO and El Paso and I don't know that anything has happened with that.

Murphy: We do have that MOU which Councilor Sorg had referenced just last item um and like I say we do communicate with the, their staff on a, on a regular basis. We make them aware of what's going on in our area. They make us what's going on in our area and should there be a crossover, I

mean the, the presentation by Molzen Corbin's an example. A majority of that work geographically is happening in the El Paso MPO area yet they, they come here to, to brief this Board on that work. So when there is, when there is a item of common interest we certainly do bring that up to both Boards.

Pedroza: Thank you very much Tom.

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Tom thank you for that information. I just, I don't know if this is the, the time or the place to do it but we specific, we had some specific comments tied to the UPWP that was included in our packet. I don't know if you'd like us to give those to you now or I can have Jolene or I summarize those and shoot them to you on e-mail just to make sure they're included in the one that comes before the Board.

Murphy: If we could, we could do both so that the rest of the Committee can hear them and then we could have the written documentation of it.

Doolittle: Okay. Just real quickly, on page 89 on Task 5 it shows an estimated cost for Task 6 so it's actually got a typo there. You have a total of $45,000 but recently I believe the MPO asked for an additional $250,000 that's not showing anywhere. So maybe that's um going to be included in your updates that you referenced a little bit tied to the costs and then we just need to make sure that when you include that additional money that it's carried over to your appendices and is reflected there on the total cost.

Sorg: Mr. Doolittle. You said that's on page 89?

Doolittle: Mr. Chair. That's correct. It's on page 89 of the handout under Task 5: Special Studies and Miscellaneous Activities.

Sorg: Okay. Very good. Each page has two numbers and so I ...

Murphy: Right.

Sorg: Believe it's also number 24.

Doolittle: Oh yes. I'm sorry.

Murphy: It's page 24 of the UPWP and page 89 of the entire packet.

Sorg: Right. Okay, very good. And so those numbers you were referring to is near the top of that page?

Doolittle: That's correct.

Sorg: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

Doolittle: And then specifically the $250,000 that I referenced earlier is for items five, or, yeah items 5.3 and 5.4 and those are on page 90 of the package or 25 of the UPWP.

Murphy: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. We'll, I'll, I'll consult with Jolene on that. I wasn't sure about including those, that $250,000 until such time I, I received notice of whether we're going to get it or not.

Doolittle: Okay.

Murphy: But again I'll consult with her and see which is the preferred way to do it.

Doolittle: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Thank you Mr. Doolittle. Any other questions about the Unified Work Program? If not we'll move on.

8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS

Sorg: Is there any comments by staff and Committee? Mr. Doolittle.

Doolittle: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'll give you just a real quick update on our normal projects that we have in the area. This actually will be very brief this month. The Missouri project, we are working on the final items. We're working on some seeding, some guard rail, some cleanup. For the most part we've got all of the paving operations completed. We expect to meet substantial completion as of Friday, May 20th and you may see some small impacts to traffic while we do some minor repair work but for the most part we will be finished with that project by the end of next week. So another one that we're real happy with. I know I've made that comment before but I'm real pleased with all the traffic and you know we've met with the, with the City to discuss the medians and I think we've got some, some ideas on how to move forward with that, but ultimately at this point I'm real pleased with the overall project itself on an extremely ...

Pedroza: Oh yeah.

Doolittle: Busy part of our, our city.

Sorg: I think Councilor Pedroza ...

Pedroza: Yes.

Sorg: Has a question for Mr. Doolittle.

Pedroza: Yes Mr. Doolittle. I, and I know you're aware of it because we've talked about it. If you could uh keep me informed as to what the, the progress on those medians because there certainly has been a little bit of a concern and, and interest in there and I would like to be able to, to communicate accurately with the people in my district. Thank you.

Doolittle: Councilor Pedroza, Mr. Chair. Just, just to summarize very briefly, Deputy Secretary Anthony Lujan who is my boss came down last weekend. We went and met with Assistant City Manager Daniel Avila and Loretta just to discuss those medians. We do have an MOU with the City that very clearly defined where those medians were going to be placed. As part of that MOU it also incorporates the cost and the money that we were going to spend to include those medians had other work tied to that MOU, for instance, the signals, the paving of the roadway, those types of things. But ultimately it's in the City's hands what they're going to do with it but the expectation is if they start removing things that were included in the MOU there will be some sort of reimbursement to Federal Highway. I do not have the specifics tied to that dollar amount or, or the reason for that reimbursement yet. I'm having that discussion with Federal Highway but we'll continue to have that discussion with Mr. Avila and ...

Pedroza: Thank you very much.

Doolittle: And Ms. Reyes.

Pedroza: Yes, and I would, I believe would like to see the MOU but I will get that from ...

Doolittle: Okay.

Pedroza: Staff. Thank you.

Doolittle: Sure. Mr. Chair. The other one that I wanted to provide just a very quick update on is on our Union Bridge project on I-10. We should be finished with that project the first week of June at least through substantial completion. Those of you that have driven over there, we have traffic shifted right now we, while we work on some sidewalk on the east side of the roadway to improve ADA and sight distance coming off of Sam Steele. But we should be finished with that project um again the first week of June.

Just real briefly the other ones that we have in the area, we've done the mill, the mill and inlay two projects that I mentioned last month that basically run from Corralitos to the Texas-New Mexico state line. Those

are actually working very well since we're doing the paving at night between Las Cruces and El Paso. They're currently working on the sealcoat on the west side of town and then will start working on final application of striping. But ultimately impacts of those should be fairly minimal with some simple lane closures or night work. With that Mr. Chair I believe that summarizes my project update for this month.

Sorg: Thank you.

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Any other comments?

Barraza: Mr. Chair.

Sorg: Where are you?

Barraza: Right here.

Sorg: Oh. Mayor Barraza. Yeah.

Barraza: Yes. I, I just, I have a concern I guess or maybe I just need clarification or if there's a misunderstanding is yesterday Ashleigh Curry came to meet with me and, regarding the bike, what are we calling this project?

Flores: The multiuse path.

Barraza: Multiuse path. And she said that her Committee, the BPAC meeting, that they had stated that the Town of Mesilla was against one of the plans as was EBID or EBID and the Town of Mesilla were not in favor of using the laterals and I don't know where they got that information from because the Town of Mesilla has never said, or I have never said to anyone that I've talked to that we do not want the path on the, on the laterals in the Town of Mesilla. I think the last time that we spoke and I think we met with DOT, and I think Trent and Jolene were also there and Harold, and we discussed that for a bit. I've talked to Gary Esslinger, not just but, about this particular project but other issues but this project did come up and how we are in agreeance that using the laterals would be a good idea. So I need someone to clarify to me and to Trustee Flores also what exactly is going on with this.

Murphy: Certainly Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. Well from our meetings with, with staff of, from the Town of Mesilla as well of, as Dona Ana County we've, come to the realization that there's a, a, basically a sticking, a sticking point in either the Town or the County developing a Memorandum of Understanding with EBID to enable further, you know further discussion of

those trails for use. Meaning that um for example the, the City had, had, has one expired but they're, but they've told us that they aim to renew it, but they have a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the liability and maintenance of those, of those trail, of, of those lateral portions that are used within the trails. So really what it needs to be is, is the, the County and the Town, County or the Town or one or the other, in order to use one of the, the EBID facilities within the trail system they need to develop that MOU that addresses the, the liability and the maintenance concerns. And from what our understanding from talking with your staffs is that um those two groups have not been able to come together in order to get that document formed.

Barraza: Who in particular in the staff because I, Debbi sat in that conversation with us yesterday, our Public Works Director and she said that's not what she said. And so I, I, that's why I'm saying I'm not sure where this information, I mean if our staff member's saying that I need to know who did and why they say that because ...

Murphy: Okay.

Barraza: We have been, we had worked with EBID and we never were told that we needed to put together an MOU with EBID. That, this is the first I've heard about it, it, well it's not the first. I heard in discussions that we would have to, you know if this is the way the trail was going to go that we would eventually have to do the MOU, but I didn't think we were that far in the process to even bring, for EBID and the Town of Mesilla to sit at the table to put together any type of MOU. So I, I, I, there's confusion obviously because it is something that we have supported and I think when Trustee Flores, myself sat down with your staff, well we were just very adamant that we wanted to hopefully see that path and we had a, an idea with the options that were given to us what we would like to see.

Murphy: Then thank you Mayor. I, it was Ms. Lujan that, that we had heard that from. Perhaps we had misinterpreted what she had said but I, I do know and it was at, on, on the record at the TAC that County staff was, said that they have reached an absolute impasse as far as developing an MOU. But if the Town's able to develop an MOU with, with EBID I think it would probably be, I think it'd be great for us to be able to put those trail segments you know within the Town back onto that map as a top priority and I think probably what we would ask of you is to keep us informed on how those discussions with EBID goes as far as developing, developing that document which allows us to move to the next step.

Barraza: Okay, very good. Because I do know that one part of the trail would be coming down Calle del Norte which is basically a DOT road but the Town

of Mesilla would be involved and I think there's some funding, a funding grant that needs to be submitted I think by August ...

Flores: September.

Barraza: September that we need to work on so maybe what I need to do is schedule a meeting between EBID, ourselves, and with your office to figure out and to see if it's even still an option. I don't know how far in the process you all are in this path so we definitely need to get together. And I don't know if Trustee Flores want, wanted to make a comment about this also.

Flores: I, I ...

Sorg: Go ahead Trustee.

Flores: Was just going to say that I, at the meeting with staff I did say that I had a concern about EBI, EBID's request for maintenance, you know that I knew that they had some things that they wanted in return, that it wasn't just a free ride of being able to use the acequias and the trails there, that we would have to maintain it and, and I you know didn't know if we could accept what EBID wanted. But I didn't say we weren't willing to look at it and you stated at that time that you were willing to look into it and ask them about it so.

Barraza: Okay. Okay.

Sorg: Mr. Murphy. Do you have a copy of that MOU with the City and EB, EBID in your files?

Murphy: We've, we do have it somewhere.

Sorg: Okay. Could you send it to the City, or Town of Mesilla?

Hancock: And the County.

Sorg: And the County.

Hancock: Commissioner Hancock.

Sorg: Hancock.

Murphy: Yes.

Barraza: Okay. And Mr. Chair if I may.

Sorg: Sure.

Barraza: For clarify, just repeat this again to me Tom. But the County said that they would not want to participate, the impasse?

Murphy: Mr. Chair, Mayor Barraza. And this is, this is from the County staff that represents on, on the Technical Advisory Committee and, and they, they said it was their understanding that, that County Legal, or County Legal or EBID Legal were unable, are unable to, to come to terms on that and it's probably a maintenance and a liability you know, that, that's usually where these things break down. But they told us not, not to expect it to be within the county and I think at that time that Debbi had, Debbi had indicated that the Town was also you know, had questions about being able to, to do the you know the maintenance portion, portion that EBID requests. But if it, you know certainly if you, if that's something that can be worked out you know the MPO can adjust its plans accordingly.

Barraza: And, and then the other is I think the plan that Ms. Curry mentioned to me yesterday that I, I know she is not in favor of is using Avenida de Mesilla and it, putting a bike lane on Avenida de Mesilla. Is that what was discussed or can someone elaborate on that?

Murphy: There was a portion, I guess based on our discussion here last month the Policy Committee told us you know to you know concentrate on, on in-roadway facilities due to this, you know due to the impasse that we've been observing with EBID. So we developed a routing that did not, did not need to go onto a lateral. It does not preclude any laterals from be, or laterals or drains from being used in the future but it would identify a priority corridor using only roadway, only existing roadways.

Barraza: Okay. And so is it something that you all would have to work, since Avenida de Mesilla is a DOT road is, you would have to go through New Mexico DOT versus through the Town? I, I'm not sure how that works. And who picks up the liability there?

Murphy: I, Mayor Barraza, I believe that the, I'm not an attorney, I can't discuss liability. I can just discuss what my, my, or my experience are. Avenida de Mesilla currently has bike lanes on it if I'm not mistaken, from ...

Barraza: That is correct.

Murphy: And ...

Barraza: I know we've had some issues and problems with the, the grates, the, where the sewer lines go in that we've had ...

Murphy: Some ...

Barraza: A couple of bicycle, well maybe one or two since I've been Mayor that I'm aware of, where their tire has gotten stuck there and DOT has gone and fixed that.

Murphy: So ...

Barraza: But ...

Murphy: So I'd say whoever has ...

Barraza: There are two, they, but they're not identified are they, as bike lanes, Trent?

Murphy: I do know it's got a designation of State Bike Route 1 but I, I don't know if there's actual bike lane signs.

Barraza: I don't think so.

Doolittle: Mr. Chair, Mayor. I, I think that's correct. It's designated but I don't, I don't even think we have the bike emblems ...

Barraza: No, they're not there.

Doolittle: Signing or anything like that on the roadway itself.

Murphy: Well as far as the liability question I would, I would imagine whoever has liability over that today would have liability at such point when it's designated as a, a, a, a loop.

Barraza: Okay. Okay, thank you.

Sorg: Thank you Mayor.

Barraza: Okay. Thank you.

Sorg: Last, last comment by Commissioner Hancock.

Hancock: If we recall in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, it calls for the laterals to be used as bike trails throughout the county. And that was approved by the County Commission. Part of the issue, if not the biggest part of the issue is the maintenance cost and the liability issue. The County is not insured by the Municipal League and so we have to deal with our own separate pool and it creates other issues that we have yet to resolve. But it is in the Comprehensive Plan. It is an, it is a, an, an important element of the

livability principles of all of Dona Ana County including all the municipalities and we will work out the problem somehow, so that's kind of where we are.

Murphy: I, Mr. Chair and if I, if I may add on to that, um our MTP amendment regarding the trails will not take the EBID facilities off of our Trail Plan. All it does is reducing its, its priority because of, because of question, of these questions that have answers but we've not yet found out those answers.

Sorg: Okay. Very good.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sorg: All right. If, the last item on the agenda is Public Comment. I see no public unless Jolene wants to say something. Okay.

10. ADJOURNMENT (2:54 PM)

Sorg: Then I'll entertain a, adjournment motion.

Barraza: So moved.

Doolittle: Second.

Sorg: Okay. Moved and second. All those in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Sorg: Meeting adjourned.

Gill M. Sorg

Chairperson